Application/Control Number: 10/533,455 Art Unit: 2134 December 0, 2007 Page 7

Remarks.

The Examiner's comments and objections and the cited references have been carefully considered by the Applicant.

Reconsideration of the application as hereby amended is respectfully requested.

New claims 51-70, have been drafted and are herewith submitted for approval.

Claims 51 and 70 are independent and different in scope.

Claims 52-69 are eventually dependent on claim 51.

The subject-matter the new claims is based on the subject-matter of claims 26-45, now deleted, and on the disclosure of the specification.

No new matter has been added.

It is noted that the Examiner's rationale for rejecting claim 25-45 over Holowko under under 35 USC § 102 has been based on giving to the words in claims meanings considered as corresponding to Holowko's features such as (for claim 25) first memory means=memory location accessible by the CPU device; second memory means =portable smart card; remote data transfer means= portable smart card (also); and (for claim 32) identification transponder =provide computer.

As far as it appears, no feature has been however indicated in Holowko that may correspond to the correlation transponder of claim 31.

Regarding the new calims, it is submitted that the features now set forth in new main Claim 51 (and in claim 70) are defined by limitations that are not met by the features of Holowko, which fails to disclose each and every element as set forth in such claim (s).

The newly claimed features and their arrangement in the invention as claimed are neither

Application/Control Number: 10/533,455 Art Unit: 2134 December 10, 2007 Page 8

taught or suggested by Holowko.

Holowko also fails to provide suggestion or motivation to modify his device so as to meet limitations as of claim 51 (or 70).

It ensues that Holowko cannot render obvious the invention as claimed in new claims 51-70.

Therefore, claims 51-70, pending in the application, are believed to be in an allowable condition.

Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

While it is believed that the amended claims properly and clearly define the present invention, applicant would be open to any suggestion or amendment the Examiner may have or propose concerning different claim phraseology which, in the Examiner's opinion, more accurately defines the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel O'Byrne (Reg. No. 36,625)

Agent for the Applicant